Achieving Heisenberg limit of quantum metrology in non-Markovian dissipative noises

Yuan-Sheng Wang,[1] Chong Chen,[1,2] and Jun-Hong An[1,*]

[1] *Center for Interdisciplinary Studies & Key Laboratory for Magnetism and Magnetic Materials of the MoE, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, China*

[2] *Department of Physics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, New Territories, Hong Kong, China*

(Dated: February 24, 2017)

Quantum metrology pursues the fundamental enhancement to sensitive measurement on certain physical quantity by using quantum characters. It has been proposed that using entanglement, one may increase the metrology precision from the standard quantum limit (SQL) to the Heisenberg limit (HL). However, previous works showed that the HL is unattainable when the system is exposed to local dephasing noises. We here study a quantum metrology protocol based on the Ramsey interferometer influenced by local non-Markovian dissipative noises. The obtained precision scaling indicates that the HL is still achievable in large encoding-time condition, which is in sharp contrast to the Markovian approximate case. Our analysis reveals that such recovery of the HL is essentially due to the formation of a bound state between each atom and its noise. It provides an avenue for experiment to implement quantum metrology in practical noisy condition via engineering the formation of the system-environment bound state.

arXiv:1702.07145v1 [quant-ph] 23 Feb 2017

Introduction.— Ultrasensitive metrology plays an important role in physics and other science. Using quantum properties such as squeezing [1, 2] or entanglement [3–7], quantum metrology permits substantial improvement to measurement precision of physical quantities with respect to the used resource more efficiently than its classical counterpart. Any metrology precision is constrained by systematic and statistical errors. The effects of statistical errors can be reduced by repeating measurement. It is guaranteed by the center limit theorem, which states that the average of a large number N of independent measurements each having a standard deviation $\Delta\sigma$ converges to a Gaussian distribution with standard deviation or precision $\Delta\sigma/\sqrt{N}$ [8]. According to this theorem, it is found that the metrology precision with quantum probes made up of n entangled particles attains the so-called Heisenberg limit (HL) scaling n^{-1}, which surpasses the standard quantum limit (SQL) scaling $n^{-1/2}$ with uncorrelated particles used [9]. As a promising part of quantum technology, quantum metrology [8, 10] has been widely investigated in recent years due to its potential application in gravitational wave detection [11–13], atomic clocks [3, 14–18], quantum imaging [19–23], and even quantum biology [24–26].

The practical realization of quantum metrology is limited by the presence of quantum noises [27–38], which cause entanglement degradation to quantum systems. It was found that the HL returns to the SQL when the involved systems are exposed to local Markovian dephasing noises [27]. Further studies revealed that the non-Markovian effect of the local dephasing noises can cause the metrology precision to achieve the so-called Zeno limit $n^{-3/4}$ [30, 31, 35], which has been proven to be universally valid to the precision estimated under short encoding-time condition in the nonsemigroup dynamics induced by all phase-covariant uncorrelated noises [37]. Although it was claimed that the HL could be restored, the noise there is spatially correlated [39]. It is physically natural because the spatially correlated noise can induce the decoherence-free state, which could prevent the entanglement from vanishing [40]. To retrieve the HL in local noises, one has to resort to certain additional strategies, such as adaptive measurements [33], dynamical decoupling [41, 42], and error correction [43–45].

In this Letter, we investigate exactly the Ramsey-spectroscopy-based quantum metrology subjected to local non-Markovian dissipative noises. Different from Ref. [30, 31, 35, 37], which focused on the short encoding-time behavior in the dynamics, we concentrate on the long encoding-time condition. A novel precision scaling is derived. It is surprising to find that the scaling in such condition tends to the HL asymptotically. Our analysis reveals that the restoring of the HL in the long time behavior is due to the formation of a bound state of the system consisting of each atom and its quantum noise. Enriching greatly our understanding to the noise mechanism in quantum metrology, our result could supply insightful instruction to practical realization of quantum metrology via bound-state engineering.

Ideal quantum metrology.—To estimate an unknown parameter x of a physical system, we first prepare a probe and let it interact with the system to encode the parameter information. Then we measure the probe and infer the value of x from the results. The inevitable errors cause us unable to estimate x exactly. Although they can be reduced by repeating the measurement, the best precision (denoted by the root mean square) in estimating x subject to projective measurements $\sum_i \hat{M}_i^\dagger \hat{M}_i = 1$ on the probe state $\rho(x)$ is the Cramér-Rao bound [41, 46–48]

$$\delta x = [NF(x)]^{-1/2}, \tag{1}$$

where N is the measurement times and $F(x) = \sum_i [\partial_x p_i(x)]^2/p_i(x)$ with $p_i(x) = \mathrm{Tr}[\hat{M}_i \rho(x) \hat{M}_i^\dagger]$ is the

Fisher information characterizing the most information in estimating x extractable from the measurements.

We consider a concrete scheme to estimate atomic frequency ω_0 based on Ramsey spectroscopy [27, 31]. The setup has n atoms as the physical resource and three steps, i.e., the probe preparation, the parameter encoding, and the readout, as the basic procedure. In the case of the uncorrelated input state, the preparation step produces a state $|\Psi_{\rm in}\rangle = [(|g\rangle+|e\rangle)/\sqrt{2}]^{\otimes n}$, which evolves to $|\Psi_{\omega_0}\rangle = [(|g\rangle+e^{-i\omega_0 t}|e\rangle)/\sqrt{2}]^{\otimes n}$ in the step of parameter encoding realized by atomic free evolution. The readout is achieved by checking whether each atom is still in their input state, which gives us n results "yes" or "no" in probability $p_1 = \cos^2(\omega_0 t/2)$ or $p_2 = \sin^2(\omega_0 t/2)$. Then $F(\omega_0) = t^2$ can be calculated. Repeating the experiment in time duration T, we get $N = nT/t$ data. Then Eq. (1) induces

$$\delta\omega_0|^{\rm ideal}_{\rm uncor} = (nTt)^{-1/2}. \tag{2}$$

Such precision scaling to the number n of the physical resource is called SQL [9]. On the other hand, in the case of the entangled input state, the first step generates a GHZ state $|\Psi_{\rm in}\rangle = (|g\rangle^{\otimes n} + |e\rangle^{\otimes n})/\sqrt{2}$, which evolves to $|\Psi_{\omega_0}\rangle = (|g\rangle^{\otimes n} + e^{-in\omega_0 t}|e\rangle^{\otimes n})/\sqrt{2}$ in the second step. After performing a CNOT operation with the first atom as the controller and the others as the target to disentangle them and a Hadamard operation on the first atom by a $\pi/2$ pulse driving, the measurement on the first atom results in $|e\rangle$ with probability $p_1 = \cos^2(n\omega_0 t/2)$ and $|g\rangle$ with $p_2 = \sin^2(n\omega_0 t/2)$ in the readout step. It leads to $F(\omega_0) = n^2t^2$. Repeating the experiment in time duration T, we obtain $N = T/t$ results. Then we have

$$\delta\omega_0|^{\rm ideal}_{\rm ent} = (n^2Tt)^{-1/2}, \tag{3}$$

which is called HL. One can find that the precision (3) using the entanglement has a $n^{1/2}$ time improvement to the SQL (2).

Effects of dissipative noises.— In practice, it is inevitable that the atomic free evolution in parameter encoding step is obscured by the presence of quantum noise. Determined by whether system has energy exchange with quantum noise, the physical impact of quantum noise on system can be classified into dissipation and pure dephasing. Different from Refs. [27, 30, 31, 35], where the effects of pure dephasing on quantum metrology have been studies, we here focus on the action of dissipative noises on quantum metrology.

Consider the physical setting that each atom is subjected to local dissipative noises in the parameter encoding step. The Hamiltonian of the whole system reads $\hat{H} = \hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_E + \hat{H}_I$ with $\hat{H}_S = \sum_{j=1}^n \omega_0 \hat{\sigma}_j^+\hat{\sigma}_j^-$, $\hat{H}_E = \sum_{j,k}\omega_k \hat{a}^\dagger_{j,k}\hat{a}_{j,k}$, and $\hat{H}_I = \sum_{j,k} g_k(\hat{a}_{j,k}\hat{\sigma}_j^+ + {\rm H.c.})$. Here $\hat{\sigma}_j^\pm$ are the transition operator of jth atom, $\hat{a}_{j,k}$ is the annihilation operator of the kth mode with frequency ω_k of the environment interacting with jth atom. The atom-environment coupling strength is denoted by $g_k = \omega_0 \hat{\mathbf{e}}_k \cdot \mathbf{d}/\sqrt{2\varepsilon_0\omega_k V}$, where $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_k$ and V are the unit polarization vector and the normalization volume of the environment, $\mathbf{d}$ is the dipole moment of the atom, and ε_0 is the free space permittivity. After tracing the n independent environments, we obtain the exact master equation governing the parameter encoding as [49]

$$\dot{\rho}(t) = \sum_{j=1}^n \{-i\frac{\omega(t)}{2}[\hat{\sigma}_j^+\hat{\sigma}_j^-, \rho(t)] + \frac{\gamma(t)}{2}\check{\mathcal{L}}_j\rho(t)\}, \tag{4}$$

where $\check{\mathcal{L}}_j\cdot = 2\hat{\sigma}_j^-\cdot\hat{\sigma}_j^+ - \{\cdot, \hat{\sigma}_j^+\hat{\sigma}_j^-\}$ and $\gamma(t) + i\omega(t) = -2\dot{c}(t)/c(t)$ with $c(t)$ determined by

$$\dot{c}(t) + i\omega_0 c(t) + \int_0^t f(t-\tau)c(\tau)d\tau = 0 \tag{5}$$

under the condition $c(0) = 1$. Here $f(t-\tau) \equiv \int J(\omega)e^{-i\omega(t-\tau)}d\omega$ is the environmental correlation function with $J(\omega) = \sum_k |g_k|^2\delta(\omega-\omega_k)$ being the spectral density. All the non-Markovian effect characterized by the convolution in Eq. (5) has been self-consistently incorporated into the time-dependent renormalized frequency $\omega(t)$ and the decay rate $\gamma(t)$ in Eq. (4). Solving Eq. (4) under the two initial input states and repeating the same procedure as the ideal case, we can evaluate

$$\delta\omega_0|_{\rm uncor} = \left\{\frac{nT[\partial_{\omega_0}{\rm Re}(c(t))]^2}{t[1-{\rm Re}^2(c(t))]}\right\}^{-1/2}, \tag{6}$$

$$\delta\omega_0|_{\rm ent} = \left\{\frac{T[\partial_{\omega_0}{\rm Re}(c^n(t))]^2}{t[1-{\rm Re}^2(c^n(t))]}\right\}^{-1/2}. \tag{7}$$

In the ideal case, $\lim_{g_k\to 0} c(t) = \exp(-i\omega_0 t)$ and thus Eqs. (6) and (7) return to Eqs. (2) and (3), respectively.

Under the physical condition that the system-environment coupling is weak and the characteristic time scale of $f(t-\tau)$ is much smaller than the one of the system, we can apply Markovian approximation to Eq. (5) and obtain $c(t) = \exp[-(\tilde{\gamma}/2 + i(\omega_0+\Delta\omega))t]$ with $\tilde{\gamma} = 2\pi J(\omega_0)$ and $\Delta\omega = \mathcal{P}\int\frac{J(\omega)}{\omega-\omega_0}d\omega$. Substituting $c(t)$ in Eqs. (6) and (7) and optimizing ω_0 and t, we obtain $\min(\delta\omega_0|_{\rm uncor}) = \min(\delta\omega_0|_{\rm ent}) = (nT/\tilde{\gamma}e)^{-1/2}$ when $\omega_0 t = k\pi/2$ and $k\pi/(2n)$ for odd k and $t = 1/\tilde{\gamma}$ and $1/(n\tilde{\gamma})$, respectively. One can find that the best precision using the entanglement becomes the exactly same as the one using the uncorrelated input. It means that the HL is unattainable and the advantage of using the entanglement in quantum metrology entirely disappears under the Markovian dissipative noises.

In the non-Markovian dynamics, we can solve Eq. (5) using Laplace transform and obtain $\tilde{c}(s) = [s + i\omega_0 + \tilde{\mu}(s)]^{-1}$ with $\tilde{\mu}(s) = \int_{\omega_c}^\infty \frac{J(\omega)}{s+i\omega}d\omega$ and ω_c being the bottom of the environmental energyband. According to Cauchy residue theorem, the inverse Laplace transform of $\tilde{c}(s)$ can be done by finding the poles of $\tilde{c}(s)$ via

$$y(E) \equiv \omega_0 + \int_{\omega_c}^\infty \frac{J(\omega)}{E-\omega}d\omega = E, \ (E = is). \tag{8}$$

It is interesting to note that the roots of Eq. (8) are nothing else but the eigenenergies in single-excitation subspace of the whole system consisting of each atom and its environment [50]. It is understandable based on the fact that the atomic dissipation induced by the zero-temperature environment is dominated by the single-excitation process of the whole system. Since $y(E)$ is a monotonically decreasing function when $E < \omega_c$, Eq. (8) has one discrete root if $y(\omega_c) < \omega_c$. It has an infinite number of roots in the region $E > \omega_c$, which form a continuous energyband. We name this discrete eigenstate with the eigenenergy $E_0 < \omega_c$ bound state. Its formation would cause profound consequences to the atomic dissipation dynamics. To see this, we make the inverse Laplace transform and obtain

$$c(t) = Ze^{-iE_0t} + \int_{i\epsilon+\omega_c}^{i\epsilon+\infty} \frac{dE}{2\pi}\tilde{c}(-iE)e^{-iEt}, \qquad (9)$$

where the first term with $Z = [1 + \int_{\omega_c}^{\infty} \frac{J(\omega)}{(E_0-\omega)^2}d\omega]^{-1}$ is contributed from the bound state and the second term contains the contributions from the continuous energyband. Oscillating with time in continuously changing frequencies, the second term in Eq. (9) behaves as a decay and approaches zero in the long-time limit due to the out-of-phase interference. Therefore, if the bound state is absent, then $\lim_{t\to\infty} c(t) = 0$, which characterizes a complete decoherence; while if the bound state is formed, then $\lim_{t\to\infty} c(t) = Ze^{-iE_0t}$, which implies that the atomic dissipation is inhibited and partial of the quantum entanglement of the n atoms can be preserved in the steady state [50].

The formation of the bound state significantly affects the attainable precision of quantum metrology in the non-Markovian dissipative noises. It is remarkably to find that the HL is achievable in the large-encoding-time condition when the bound state is formed. To reveal this, by substituting the form Ze^{-iE_0t} of large-time $c(t)$ into Eq. (7), we have

$$\min(\lim_{t\to\infty} \delta\omega_0|_{\rm ent}) \leq Z^{-(n+1)}(n^2Tt)^{-1/2}, \qquad (10)$$

where $\partial_{\omega_0}E_0 = Z$ has been used. Equation (10) would reach the HL (3) when Z approaches 1. Representing the contribution of the bound state to the residual excited-state population, Z^2 can be controlled by manipulating the environmental spectral density $J(\omega)$.

Physical realization.—To illustrate the significant impacts of the bound state and the non-Markovian effect on the metrology precision, we explicitly consider a band-gapped environment in photonic crystal setting. The dispersion relation of such structured environment reads $\omega_k = \omega_c + A(k-k_0)^2$, where ω_c is the bottom frequency of the environmental energyband, and $A = \omega_c/k_0^2$ with $k_0 \simeq \omega_c/c$ [51–53]. Using Laplace-transform method, we



FIG. 1. (a): Steady-state $|c(t)|$ of each atom in different detuning δ evaluated from Eq. (11) marked by squares and from Z in green solid line. The inset shows the time evolution of $c(t)$, which approaches Z in the long-time limit. (b): Energy spectrum of the each atom-environment system, where the gray area denotes the energyband. Here $\omega_c = 100\gamma_0$ and $n = 10$ are used.

can calculate

$$c(t) = e^{-i\omega_0 t}\sum_{j=1}^{3} a_j e^{(i\delta+\beta x_j^2)t}\left[x_j + \sqrt{x_j^2}\mathrm{Erf}(\sqrt{\beta x_j^2}t)\right], \qquad (11)$$

where $\beta = \omega_c(\pi\gamma_0/2\omega_0)^{2/3}$ with $\gamma_0 = \omega_0^3 d^2/(3\pi\epsilon_0 c^3)$, $\delta = \omega_0 - \omega_c$, and $a_j = x_j/[(x_j - x_i)(x_j - x_k)]$ $(i \neq j \neq k = 1, 2, 3)$ with x_j being the solutions of the equation $(\beta x^2 + i\delta)\sqrt{\beta}x - (i\beta)^{3/2} = 0$. Here γ_0 is the vacuum spontaneous emission rate characterizing the intrinsic lifetime of the atoms. Taking γ_0 as the frequency scale, we will neglect its dependence on ω_0. We can analytically prove

$$\lim_{|\delta|\to\infty} |c(t)| = \left|[1 + \frac{1}{2}(-\beta/\delta)^{3/2}]^{-1}e^{-(\beta^3/\delta)^{1/2}t}\right|, \qquad (12)$$

which includes two cases with positive and negative δ. For positive δ, Eq. (12) decays to zero in constant rate $(\beta^3/\delta)^{1/2}$. Thus we can prove from Eq. (7) that $\lim_{\delta\to+\infty} \min(\delta\omega_0|_{\rm ent}) = (nT/\tilde{\gamma}e)^{-1/2}$ with $\tilde{\gamma} = 2(\beta^3/\delta)^{1/2}$, which is just the SQL and recovers the Markovian approximate result. For negative δ, Eq. (12) tends to the nonzero value $\left[1 + \frac{1}{2}(-\beta/\delta)^{3/2}\right]^{-1}$, which matches with our bound-state analysis.

Figure 1(a) shows the numerical result of long-time $|c(t)|$ in different δ. One can check from Eq. (4) that $|c(t)|^2$ just represents the time-dependent factor of the excited-state population of each atom. It is interesting to find that, when $\omega_0 < \omega_c$, the atom can be partially stabilized in its excited state even in the presence of the dissipative environment. This is quite different from the



FIG. 2. (a): Dynamical evolution of the metrology precision $\delta\omega_0|_{\rm ent}$ (cyan solid line) and the envelope of its local minima (red dot-dashed line) when the detuning $\delta = -20\gamma_0$. (b) and (c): Minimal metrology precision of $\delta\omega_0|_{\rm ent}$ evaluated from the local minima as function of encoding time t in different detuning δ. The gray area denotes the regime beyond the HL. The gray lines in (c) represent the results evaluated from Eq. (10). Other parameters are the same as Fig. 1.

Markovian approximate and the bound-state-absent results where the atom decays completely to its ground state. Figure 1(b) is the energy spectrum of the whole system formed by each atom and its environment. It shows that the regime where the atomic excited-state population is preserved matches well with the one where an atom-environment bound state is formed in the environmental bandgap. It is physically understandable based on the fact that the bound state, as a stationary state of the whole system, would preserve the excited-state population in its superposed components during time evolution. Thus $|c(t)|$ approaches the value Z contributed uniquely from the bound state [see Fig. 1(a) and its inset]. It is remarkable to find that $|c(t)|$ and Z even tend to 1 when the atomic frequency falls in the deep of the environmental energy bandgap.

With the analytical form (11) at hands, we can readily obtain the metrology precision $\delta\omega_0|_{\rm ent}$ from Eq. (7). Figure 2(a) shows time evolution of $\delta\omega_0|_{\rm ent}$ as function of the encoding time t for definite detuning δ. Oscillating with time, $\delta\omega_0|_{\rm ent}$ takes its best values as the envelope of the local minima [see red dot-dashed line in Fig. 2(a)]. By this way, we can evaluate the best metrology precision $\min(\delta\omega_0|_{\rm ent})$ in different detuning δ [see Fig. 2(b)]. One can find that with the formation of the bound state in negative δ regime, $\min(\delta\omega_0|_{\rm ent})$ decreases with increasing t. It is in sharp contrast to the case without the bound state in positive δ regime, where it increases with increasing t. It is surprising to find that with further decreasing δ in the bound-state regime, $\min(\delta\omega_0|_{\rm ent})$ can even approach the HL. It reveals the significant effect induced by the bound state in noisy quantum metrology. To further verify this result, we compare in 2(c) the precision with the scaling (10). After shot-time jolting, the precision tends to the scaling (10). Setting the encoding time as large as $t \simeq 10/\gamma_0$, we plot in Fig. 3 $\min(\delta\omega_0|_{\rm ent})$ as function of atomic number n. Once again, it verifies the validity of the scaling (10). Furthermore, with decreasing δ, the precision approaches near and near the HL. It confirms our expectation that the precision asymptotically matching the analytical scaling (10) approaches the HL for deeply small δ. It implies that, due to the distinguished role played by the bound state, quantum metrology under independent dissipation can even performs better than the one under independent dephasing, where the precision scales as the Zeno limit $n^{-3/4}$ [30, 31, 35].



FIG. 3. Minimal metrology precision of $\delta\omega_0|_{\rm ent}$ as function of the atomic number n in different detuning δ. The encoding time is chosen at $t = 10/\gamma_0$. The gray area denotes the regime beyond the HL. The gray lines represent the results evaluated from Eq. (10). Other parameters are the same as Fig. 1.

Conclusions.— In summary, we have investigated the Ramsey-spectroscopy-based quantum metrology in the presence of local non-Markovian dissipative noises. It has been revealed that, quite different from the pure dephasing noise case, the metrology precision in dissipative noises can still reach the HL in long encoding-time condition. It is attributed to the formation of a bound state between each atom and its quantum noise. Our result suggests an active way to realize the ultrahighly precise measurement in the practical noisy situation by engineering the formation of the bound state. It could play instructive role in frequency estimation experiments and be generalized readily to other estimation scenarios.

Acknowledgments.—This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation (Grant No. 11474139), by the Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University, and by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities of China.

* anjhong@lzu.edu.cn

[1] M. J. Holland and K. Burnett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 1355 (1993).
[2] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Science **306**, 1330 (2004).
[3] J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano, D. J. Wineland, and D. J. Heinzen, Phys. Rev. A **54**, R4649 (1996).
[4] K. J. Resch, K. L. Pregnell, R. Prevedel, A. Gilchrist, G. J. Pryde, J. L. O'Brien, and A. G. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 223601 (2007).
[5] T. Nagata, R. Okamoto, J. L. O'Brien, K. Sasaki, and S. Takeuchi, Science **316**, 726 (2007).
[6] J. A. Jones, S. D. Karlen, J. Fitzsimons, A. Ardavan, S. C. Benjamin, G. A. D. Briggs, and J. J. L. Morton, Science **324**, 1166 (2009).
[7] Y. Israel, S. Rosen, and Y. Silberberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 103604 (2014).
[8] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Nat Photon **5**, 222 (2011).
[9] W. M. Itano, J. C. Bergquist, J. J. Bollinger, J. M. Gilligan, D. J. Heinzen, F. L. Moore, M. G. Raizen, and D. J. Wineland, Phys. Rev. A **47**, 3554 (1993).
[10] V. Giovannetti, S. Lloyd, and L. Maccone, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 010401 (2006).
[11] R. Schnabel, N. Mavalvala, D. E. McClelland, and P. K. Lam, Nat. Commun. **1**, 121 (2010).
[12] J. Abadie, B. P. Abbott, R. Abbott, *et al.*, Nat. Phys. **7**, 962 (2011).
[13] R. X. Adhikari, Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 121 (2014).
[14] V. Bužek, R. Derka, and S. Massar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2207 (1999).
[15] D. Leibfried, M. D. Barrett, T. Schaetz, J. Britton, J. Chiaverini, W. M. Itano, J. D. Jost, C. Langer, and D. J. Wineland, Science **304**, 1476 (2004).
[16] C. F. Roos, M. Chwalla, K. Kim, M. Riebe, and R. Blatt, Nature **443**, 316 (2006).
[17] A. Derevianko and H. Katori, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 331 (2011).
[18] A. D. Ludlow, M. M. Boyd, J. Ye, E. Peik, and P. O. Schmidt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **87**, 637 (2015).
[19] M. I. Kolobov, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71**, 1539 (1999).
[20] L. A. Lugiato, A. Gatti, and E. Brambilla, J. Opt. B **4**, S176 (2002).
[21] P. A. Morris, R. S. Aspden, J. E. C. Bell, R. W. Boyd, and M. J. Padgett, Nature Communications **6**, 5913 (2015).
[22] W. Roga and J. Jeffers, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 032301 (2016).
[23] M. Tsang, R. Nair, and X.-M. Lu, Phys. Rev. X **6**, 031033 (2016).
[24] A. Crespi, M. Lobino, J. C. F. Matthews, A. Politi, C. R. Neal, R. Ramponi, R. Osellame, and J. L. OBrien, Appl. Phys. Lett. **100**, 233704 (2012).
[25] M. A. Taylor, J. Janousek, V. Daria, J. Knittel, B. Hage, H.-A. Bachor, and W. P. Bowen, Phys. Rev. X **4**, 011017 (2014).
[26] M. A. Taylor and W. P. Bowen, Physics Reports **615**, 1 (2016).
[27] S. F. Huelga, C. Macchiavello, T. Pellizzari, A. K. Ekert, M. B. Plenio, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3865 (1997).
[28] K. Banaszek, R. Demkowicz-Dobrzanski, and I. A. Walmsley, Nat Photon **3**, 673 (2009).
[29] T. Ono and H. F. Hofmann, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 033819 (2010).
[30] Y. Matsuzaki, S. C. Benjamin, and J. Fitzsimons, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 012103 (2011).
[31] A. W. Chin, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 233601 (2012).
[32] R. Chaves, J. B. Brask, M. Markiewicz, J. Kołodyński, and A. Acín, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 120401 (2013).
[33] J. Borregaard and A. S. Sørensen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 090801 (2013).
[34] P. A. Knott, T. J. Proctor, K. Nemoto, J. A. Dunningham, and W. J. Munro, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 033846 (2014).
[35] K. Macieszczak, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 010102 (2015).
[36] Y.-L. Li, X. Xiao, and Y. Yao, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 052105 (2015).
[37] A. Smirne, J. Kołodyński, S. F. Huelga, and R. Demkowicz-Dobrzański, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 120801 (2016).
[38] J. Huang, X. Qin, H. Zhong, Y. Ke, and C. Lee, Scientific Reports **5**, 17894 (2015).
[39] J. Jeske, J. H. Cole, and S. F. Huelga, New Journal of Physics **16**, 073039 (2014).
[40] C. Chen, C.-J. Yang, and J.-H. An, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 062122 (2016).
[41] Q.-S. Tan, Y. Huang, X. Yin, L.-M. Kuang, and X. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 032102 (2013).
[42] P. Sekatski, M. Skotiniotis, and W. Dür, New Journal of Physics **18**, 073034 (2016).
[43] W. Dür, M. Skotiniotis, F. Fröwis, and B. Kraus, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 080801 (2014).
[44] T. Unden, P. Balasubramanian, D. Louzon, Y. Vinkler, M. B. Plenio, M. Markham, D. Twitchen, A. Stacey, I. Lovchinsky, A. O. Sushkov, M. D. Lukin, A. Retzker, B. Naydenov, L. P. McGuinness, and F. Jelezko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 230502 (2016).
[45] X.-M. Lu, S. Yu, and C. H. Oh, Nature Communications **6**, 7282 (2015).
[46] N. Friis, M. Skotiniotis, I. Fuentes, and W. Dür, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 022106 (2015).
[47] U. Marzolino and T. c. v. Prosen, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 062130 (2014).
[48] J. Liu, X.-X. Jing, and X. Wang, Sci. Rep. **5**, 8565 (2015).
[49] H. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, 2002).
[50] Q.-J. Tong, J.-H. An, H.-G. Luo, and C. H. Oh, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 052330 (2010).
[51] S. John and J. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2418 (1990).
[52] S. John and T. Quang, Phys. Rev. A **50**, 1764 (1994).
[53] Y. Liu and A. A. Houck, Nat Phys **13**, 48 (2017).